

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on September 28, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully considered.

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended claim 8. Claims 1 and 8 are the independent claims. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application. Also, Applicant has editorially amended the specification. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 8 has been objected because of the following informalities: "horsehoe" on page 17, line 10 and page 18, line 8 should be "horseshoe". In response thereto, claim 8 has been amended to correct the informalities noted by the examiner. It is therefore submitted that this objection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 4-5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tsai et. al.* (US 6,722,773) in view of *Fordsmand* (US 3,965,345). It is submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Applicant's independent claim 1 recites a backlight module, including a U-shaped fluorescent tube, a first heat-dissipating structure, a second heat-dissipating structure and a third heat-dissipating structure. The U-shaped fluorescent tube includes a curved tube portion, two straight-tube luminous portions, and two electrode portions. These two straight-tube luminous portions of equal length are parallel to each other and situated at the same side of the curved tube portion. Each of the straight-tube luminous portions has one end connected

to one or the other end of the curved tube portion. These two electrode portions are correspondingly disposed at the other end of the two straight-tube luminous portions. The first heat-dissipating structure, which envelops the entire or partial of curved tube portion and is thermal-conductive, is **connected to the curved tube portion**. The second heat-dissipating structure, which **envelops one of the two electrode portions** and is **thermal-conductive**, is connected to the enveloped electrode portion. The third heat-dissipating structure, which envelops the **lower half** of the central tube of **one of the two** straight-tube luminous portions and is thermal-conductive, is connected to the enveloped straight-tube luminous portion.

In contrast, *Tasi et al.* teach that the illuminating device 100 mainly includes three tube-like lamps 110 disposed in the main body, and several supporting devices 150, 160. The tube-like lamp 110 has two terminal portions 112 adapted for electrically connecting to a power source and a bending portion 114 between the terminal portions (col. 3, lines 6-14). The supporting device 160, having two hooked portions 162 for respectively holding two adjacent lamps 110, is disposed at a distance from the bending portion 114 (col. 3, lines 15-33). The hooked portions 162 of the supporting device 160 laterally covers a half surface of the lamps (FIG. 2). Accordingly, *Tasi et al.*, do not disclose or suggest a first heat-dissipating structure, connected to a bending portion 114 of the lamp, and a second heat-dissipating structure enveloping one of the two terminal portions 112.

Also, *Tasi et al.*, fail to disclose or suggest a third heat-dissipating structure enveloping the lower half of the central tube of **one of the two straight-tube** luminous portions.

Further, *Tasi et al.* teach away from using heat-dissipating material. According to the structure of the application, the first, second, and third heat-dissipating structures are made of heat dissipating material. On the contrary, *Tasi et al.* teach that the fixing mechanisms of the present invention are preferably made of materials having a low thermal conductivity, e.g., plastics such as engineering plastics or resin polymer such as PC resin or ABS resin, which thereby more efficiently reduce the heat dissipated from the contact surface between the lamp and the fixing mechanism (col. 4, lines 33-39).

The Examiner has pointed out that *Fordsmand* teaches that the cooling fixture for a fluorescent tube is made of a heat conductive material (col. 2, lines 15-19. However, *Fordsmand* does not overcome the deficiencies of *Tasi et al.*, and fails to disclose or suggest the first, second and third heat-dissipating structures as recited by claim 1. Also, the teaching of *Fordsmand* is contrary to the teaching of the *Tasi et al.*. The purposes and objectives of these two recited references are totally distinct, or even to the contrary. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have had the motivation to combine these two references. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-2, 4-5 and 7 are *prima*

facie patentably distinguishable over the cited combination of references and it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tsai et. al.* (US 6,722,773) and *Fordsmand* (US 3,965,345) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of *Delrosso* (US 6,088,501). It is submitted that claims 3 and 6 are *prima facie* patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1, from which these rejected claims respectively depend. It is requested that these claims be allowed and it is further requested that these rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 8-10, 12-13, 15-16 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tsai et. al.* (US 6,722,773) and *Fordsmand* (US 3,965,345) in view of *Moon* (US 6,796,678). Claim 8 recites features similar to claim 1, which features were deficient from the teachings of *Tsai et al.* and *Fordsmand*. Further, *Moon* fails to disclose a U-shaped fluorescent tube, a first supporting portion having a horseshoe slot, and a second supporting portion having two fixing slots. Also, *Moon* neither discloses nor suggests the two first and two second heat-dissipating structures as recited by claim 8. It therefore is submitted that independent claim 8, as well as the claims dependant therefrom, are patentable over the applied references for at least the same reasons that the independent claim 1 is patentable. As such, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 11, 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tsai et. al.* (US 6,722,773), *Fordsmand* (US 3,965,345) and *Moon* (US 6,796,678) as applied to claims 8, 9 and 15 above, and further in view of *Delrosso* (US 6,088,501). It is submitted that claims 11, 14 and 17 are *prima facie* patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as independent claims 8, from which these rejected claims respectively depend. It is requested that these claims be allowed and it is further requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Should any fee be required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert H. Berdo, Jr. – Registration No. 38,075
RABIN & BERDO, PC – Customer No. 23995
Facsimile: 202-408-0924; 202-408-5297
Telephone: 202-371-8976

December 19, 2005
Date

RHB:vm

AMENDMENT
Filed December 19, 2005

10/771,400